

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-21 were pending. Claims 1-21 were rejected. In this response, no claim has been canceled. Claims 1-2, 7, and 13-16 have been amended. In addition, new claims 22-27 have been added. Thus, claims 1-27 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,587,680 by Ala-Laurila et al. (hereinafter “Ala-Laurila”). Since Ala-Laurila was issued after the filing date of the present application, it is assumed that the rejection is under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rather than 102(b). Applicant hereby reserves the right to swear behind Ala-Laurila in the subsequent prosecution of the present application.

In view of the foregoing amendment, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 includes limitations that are not disclosed by Ala-Laurila. Specifically, independent claim 1 as amended recites as follows:

1. A method for establishing secured roaming among a wireless station, a first and a second access points, comprising:

the first access point requesting a first ticket from an authentication server and using the first ticket to establish a first secured session with the wireless station; and
in response to a second ticket request from the wireless station through the first secured session, the first access point forwarding the second ticket request to the authentication server and relaying a resulting second ticket from the authentication server to the wireless station, the second ticket being different than the first ticket, wherein the second ticket is used to establish a second secured session between the wireless station and the second access point.

(Emphasis added)

Independent claim 1 includes a first access point to establish a first secured session with a wireless station using a first ticket. In response to a second ticket request from the wireless station via the first secured session, the first access point communicates with the authentication server to obtain a second ticket from the authentication server and relays the second ticket to the wireless station (using the same first secure session). The first and second tickets are different. Thereafter, the wireless

station may use the second ticket to establish a second secured session with a second access point. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from Ala-Laurila.

Rather, in Ala-Laurila, in response to a handover request from a mobile terminal 12, a first access point (e.g., Old-AP 14) retrieves security association (SA) parameters from a database and passes the SA information and the handover request to the second access point (e.g., New-AP 114), rather than generated from an authentication server. The new AP 114 authenticates the wireless station 12 and pass the control back to the old AP 14 and the old AP 14 disassociates with the wireless station 12. Thereafter, the wireless station 12 communicates with the new AP 114 using the same SA parameters. See, for example, Figs. 5A-5C, col. 10, line 33 to col. 11, line 8 of Ala-Laurila.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no disclosure within Ala-Laurila that the first access point (e.g., Old-AP 14) communicates with an authentication server (e.g., other than the second, or new AP) to obtain a second ticket (e.g., the new session key for the second session, or the new session) via the first session (e.g., old session) in response to a request from the wireless station. Ala-Laurila also fails to disclose relaying the second ticket obtained from the authentication server to the wireless station via the first session (which is established using the first ticket). Rather, the Old-AP 14 of Ala-Laurila passes the same SA parameters to the New-AP 114.

In addition, the SA parameters are used by both session between the wireless station and the Old-AP 14 and the New-AP 114. Such SA parameters are easily subject to attack. In contrast, the first and second tickets of the present application are created differently for each session by the authentication server. The first and/or second tickets are not transmitted between the first and second access points (e.g., the old and new access points). Each ticket is only valid for the respective session between the wireless station and the corresponding access point of that session. It is respectfully submitted that Ala-Laurila fails to disclose the limitations set forth above.

Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Ala-Laurila. It is respectfully submitted that the limitations set forth above are also absent from the rest of the cited references (e.g., Norefors, Brown, and Hauser).

Similarly, independent claims 7, 13, 15, and 27 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 7, 13, 15, and 27 are not anticipated by the cited references.

Given that dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, 14, and 16-26 depend from one of the above independent claims, at least for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-6, 8-12, 14, and 16-26 are not anticipated by the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,370,380 by Norefors et al. (hereinafter “Norefors”). Claims 3, 5-9, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,689,563 by Brown et al. (hereinafter “Brown”). Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Brown as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,778,065 by Hauser et al. (hereinafter “Hauser”). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Brown as applied to claim 13 above and further in view of Norefors. Claims 15, 17, 18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Ala-Laurila and Brown. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Ala-Laurila and Brown as applied to claim 15 above, and in further view of Norefors. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in view of Ala-Laurila and Brown as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Hauser.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the limitations set forth above are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, individually or in combination. Therefore, at least for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-27 are patentable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 6/17/2004



Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300